UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIFTH COMMITTEE
42nd meeting
held on
Friday, 11 December 1992
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 42nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. DINU (Romania)

later: Ms. ROTHEISER (Austria)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 109: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 104: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993 (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/47/L.20/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 97 (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/47/L.16 concerning agenda item 93 (b)

AGENDA ITEM 124: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ASPECTS OF THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/47/SR.42
18 December 1992

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

92-58218 6536S (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 109: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued) (A/46/34 and A/46/219; A/47/16 (Part I), A/47/34, A/47/119, A/47/276, A/47/373 and A/47/755)

1. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) said that the submission by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) of the annual report on its work provided an opportunity for the Committee to engage in a fruitful dialogue with the Unit and to evaluate the Unit's work. In that connection, it was appropriate to ask whether the Unit had successfully carried out its work programme during the period under consideration. In order to enable the Committee to answer that question, the Unit's report should have indicated in a precise manner the number and type of specific objectives achieved. Another issue which the report addressed was the extent to which the Unit's recommendations had been implemented. Since a selective approach had prevailed in the past, he was encouraged by the trend towards greater implementation of the Unit's recommendations.

2. With respect to the quality of the Unit's work, the assessments of the Unit itself, ACABQ and others provided a range of opinions. While the Unit's report sometimes took on a triumphal tone, the report of ACABQ had identified areas in which the Unit's work had been unfocused. He believed that the truth regarding the Unit's performance lay somewhere in between those two poles. The Inspectors should be made to specify how they could respond to practical difficulties. The Unit had experienced problems with respect to staffing and technical resources. His Government appreciated the comments by ACABQ on the subject, and it supported the Unit's request for additional resources to meet its personnel and technical needs.

3. With respect to the Unit's future work programme, while he recognized that specific items could be subject to change, he believed that priority should be given in 1993 and 1994 to projects already under way in connection with the restructuring of the Organization, in particular problems of decentralization and coordination within major United Nations organizations and within the United Nations system as a whole. Assessments by JIU of the management of activities pursuant to the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation of Africa would also be of particular merit. During 1993 and 1994, activities in that area would reach a critical stage, and the Unit should concentrate on evaluating the effectiveness of the system-wide implementation of programmes.

4. Turning to the question of strengthening the effectiveness of JIU, he said that there had already been an extensive exchange of views between the Unit and ACABQ in that regard. He endorsed the recommendations of the ACABQ report with respect to the selection of Inspectors. According to article 2, paragraph 1, of the statute of the Unit (resolution 31/192, annex), Inspectors should be chosen from among members of national supervision or inspection bodies, or from among persons of a similar competence on the basis of their special experience in national or international administrative and financial

(Mr. Monthe, Cameroon)

matters, including management questions. While he believed that the ACABQ recommendations were crucial to maintaining the excellence of the Inspectors, at a certain stage it became the responsibility of the General Assembly to ensure that excellence was maintained.

5. In drawing up its work programme, the Unit should exchange views with the organizations and agencies concerned, as that was the best way to ensure that their needs were taken into account. In addition, he believed that a proper balance between the research and the inspection work of the Unit could be struck as long as the Unit confined its research activities to new methods of monitoring and inspection in the areas of planning, budgeting and programme evaluation. Obviously, such activities would benefit from coordination with ACABQ and the United Nations Institute of Training and Research (UNITAR). He expressed support for the JIU request for additional personnel and technical equipment in order to strengthen the efficiency of the Unit in investigating, monitoring, inspecting and standard-setting. He hoped that the Assembly would continue to pay close attention to the reports of the Unit and said that in order to do that it would be necessary for JIU to continue to submit annual reports.

6. Mr. DIPP (Dominican Republic) said that JIU had performed its work in an efficient manner, as demonstrated by the cost savings in telecommunications, translation services and travel mentioned in paragraph 60 of its report (A/47/34), and it was hoped that further economies would result from the current analysis of conference services. The addition of five new Inspectors should provide new impetus to the Unit's work in the future. He welcomed the recommendations of the Advisory Committee with regard to measures to improve the impact of the Inspector's reports, and said that the dialogue between JIU and ACABQ should be broadened. Lastly, he supported the Unit's request for additional computer equipment and personnel, but believed it would be preferable to finance those items from the Unit's existing budget.

7. Mr. SUKAYRI (Jordan), said that his country, which had been among the first to join in efforts for reform and restructuring at the United Nations, believed that reform was a process which must draw on accumulated expertise but constantly adapt to the new requirements of a changing world. The Joint Inspection Unit, as an independent body with a statute accepted by Member States, the Secretariat and participating organizations, could play an effective role in that process. As probably all would agree, the basic principles underlying the existence and functions of the Unit remained valid; it simply remained for those principles to be strengthened by the Inspectors themselves, the Secretariat and participating organizations, in close cooperation with other bodies entrusted with related but different mandates such as the Advisory Committee, the Board of Auditors and the Panel of External Auditors.

8. Noting the indications in the Unit's reports of closer consultation between it and participating organizations, particularly concerning inspection and evaluation, his delegation emphasized the need for full cooperation

(Mr. Sukayri, Jordan)

between them, as mentioned by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 14 of its report (A/47/755). Improved performance and productivity would be impossible without such cooperation. The Unit might wish to work in the course of the coming year towards the establishment of a formal set of inspection standards to be approved by the participating agencies, as suggested by the Advisory Committee.

9. It was also of importance that the Unit and participating organizations reach agreement on a programme or programmes of work to be carried out within a specific time-frame without, of course, any prejudice to the Inspectors' independence of opinion or entitlement to conduct investigations without prior notification, or to the fundamental purposes of the Unit's work.

10. With a view to ensuring the necessary level of competence and ability, while the current procedure for selection and appointment of Inspectors was basically sound, there was room for some improvement, particularly at the stage of submission of candidates. His delegation believed that experience gained in the United Nations system was a useful qualification, but had doubts about the Advisory Committee's suggestion that countries submit multiple candidates. The Unit's competence and ability also inevitably depended on the human, technical and financial resources at its disposal: those resources might need to be increased.

11. His delegation was pleased to note the first appointment as an Inspector of a candidate from his country. It hoped that the new blood provided by all the recently appointed Inspectors would also help to enhance the Unit's performance and productivity.

12. Mr. MERIFIELD (Canada), speaking in connection with the term of appointment for members of the Board of Auditors, said that, since the United Nations had adopted a biennial accounting period, it was appropriate to review the original three-year term for members of the Board of Auditors so that membership would coincide with the accounting cycle. He therefore suggested either a four-year term with the possibility of re-election for a second term, or a six-year term without the possibility of immediate re-election. Elections would then take place every two years for terms that would end six months after the conclusion of a biennium. Such a move would enhance the effectiveness of the Board of Auditors since the same Board would audit the accounts for the entire biennium. He looked forward to hearing comments from the Advisory Committee and the Board of Auditors on the question.

13. He also welcomed the dialogue between the Panel of External Auditors and the Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions concerning the development of common accounting standards and looked forward to the implementation of those standards for the biennium ending on 31 December 1993. In addition, the standards should be periodically reviewed and updated to adapt them to the changing information needs of Member States and to international accounting guidelines.

14. Mr. OSELLA (Argentina), speaking on behalf of the Rio Group, said that the two main attributes of the Joint Inspection Unit were its autonomous character and the system-wide nature of its mandate. However, despite the extensive scope of that mandate, the Member States and bodies in the system did not appear to give due weight to its work. Consideration should therefore be given to the changes needed to enable the Unit to fulfil its functions properly.

15. First of all, greater participation was needed by the Member States in determining the work programme of JIU in order to set priorities and ensure that the Unit complied with them. Second, there was a need to identify more clearly the comparative advantages of JIU in relation to other technical bodies responsible for the monitoring and improvement of administrative management, such as the Advisory Committee, the Board of Auditors and the internal auditors of the respective bodies. Member States needed to work out a clear division of labour in order to enable them to assign specific tasks to the Unit. Finally, a cost-benefit analysis was needed with a view to providing JIU with a level of funding appropriate to the contribution it made.

16. In order to respond to the above requirements, the work of the Unit needed to be examined in the context of the system as a whole, so as to identify the factors which had limited its productivity and impact.

17. He noted the proposal to establish an office of inspector-general, but felt that further clarification was needed as to its planned relationship with existing bodies responsible for administrative management, before Member States could give their views.

18. Mr. STITT (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States, expressed disappointment at the fact that, for the second year running, the Committee would not have time to give the reports of the Unit the in-depth study they merited. He welcomed the clear description of the problems facing the Joint Inspection Unit provided by the Advisory Committee's report. It must be acknowledged that, although some of the Unit's reports were of considerable interest and led to significant follow-up, not all the work of the Inspectors was of the same relevance. He therefore endorsed the Advisory Committee's recommendations, particularly those contained in paragraphs 29 and 32 to 37, and urged that JIU should comply with them. He also noted the conclusions contained in paragraph 42.

19. The Twelve had already expressed their concern over the general state of the internal and external evaluation and monitoring mechanisms in the parts of the United Nations covered by the plan and the programme budget, and it was only right to consider the contribution being made by JIU in that context. Although the statute of the Unit predated the introduction of the current programme planning, budgeting, evaluation and monitoring rules, it was appropriate for the Unit's role to be considered in a broader context, as it was in the Advisory Committee's report, and he hoped that the Unit would consider carefully the points made by the Advisory Committee when drawing up its work programme for future years. Governments were entitled to be

(Mr. Stott, United Kingdom)

concerned about the volume, quality and relevance of the Inspectors' recommendations and it might be appropriate to consider those questions in greater depth at the forty-ninth session, when the Committee might also have the benefit of the views of the Secretary-General and the Administrative Committee on Coordination.

20. Mr. KOULYK (Ukraine) said that, while it was clear from the annual report (A/47/34) that the Unit had had made some important contributions, nevertheless the Inspectors could have been more critical of the Unit's performance, particularly with regard to the question of management in the Secretariat. The mandate of the Unit set out in General Assembly decision 46/446 required that the Committee should examine the work of the Unit even more closely; therefore, he agreed that the time allotted for consideration of the JIU work programme and its report was insufficient.

21. He identified areas in which the Unit had had significant achievements during the past year, noting that the participation of the Committee had been instrumental in that success. In that connection, he drew attention to the Unit's studies on the use of balances in the United Nations system and managing works of art in the United Nations. On the other hand, Member States still did not know what would be done with the Nobel Peace Prize money which the Organization had won for its work in peace-keeping operations. He noted with satisfaction the Unit's intention to examine the institutional, administrative and financial consequences of the United Nations role in peace-keeping operations, and said that such attention was justified, as peace-keeping was becoming an ever-larger responsibility for the Organization.

22. He drew attention to paragraph 18 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/47/755), which stated that the Unit was unresponsive to suggestions of the organizations in drawing up its work programme. In that connection, he requested that the Vice-Chairman of the Unit should explain how the Unit took into account the recommendations of the Organization and how it analysed decisions and reports of the General Assembly. He expressed his agreement with the conclusion in paragraph 29 of the same report, which noted that there had been no real follow-up with respect to the recommendations of JIU, and he endorsed the Advisory Committee's recommendation in paragraph 37 that consideration should be given to introducing a form of budget implication statement in respect of JIU recommendations whose implementation would entail major financial expenditures.

AGENDA ITEM 104: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993 (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/47/L.20/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 97 (continued) (A/47/7/Add.12; A/C.5/47/55)

23. Mr. MERIFIELD (Canada) welcomed the statement submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/47/55) and noted that the resolution in question had been adopted by the Third Committee following submission of that document, in

(Mr. Merifield, Canada)

accordance with the rules. However, he agreed with the recommendation contained in the report of the Advisory Committee (A/47/7/Add.12) that the Secretary-General's estimate should be reduced from $2,577,000 to $2,000,000. He recommended that an amount of $2 million should be appropriated and that the expenditure should be considered of an extraordinary nature, relating to the maintenance of peace and security, and should be treated outside the procedures related to the contingency fund, as advocated by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/47/55, para. 21).

24. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that the question was a very serious one and his delegation supported the activities concerned. He recalled that the Committee had experienced similar difficulties in the past in discussing the financing of a monitoring mission to Haiti. The main problem was how to accommodate the expenditure in question within the budgetary procedure laid down in resolution 41/213. The amount concerned was modest and, according to the Advisory Committee, could be slightly reduced. While he welcomed the willingness of the representative of Canada to accept the Advisory Committee's recommendations on the level of the expenditure, he would ask him to recognize the possible implications of his proposal for the new budgetary procedure. The problem which had led to the adoption of resolution 41/213 had been the accumulation of additions to the regular budget, creating the impression that the overall level of the budget was out of control because of a general failure to appreciate that available resources were finite. Although he realized that it might be difficult to negotiate an acceptable compromise, he did wish to point out that if the Advisory Committee's proposal was adopted it would not prevent the activities concerned from being undertaken, but would allow them to continue while leaving the question of the method of financing undecided. He was also concerned at the relative lateness with which the Secretariat had begun its efforts to collect voluntary contributions. In view of the urgency of the question, he hoped that action could be taken speedily on an agreed basis.

25. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in the light of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/47/55) and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee (A/47/7/Add.12), the Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.3/47/L.20/Rev.1, an appropriation of $2 million would be required under section 2 of the programme budget for 1992-1993. It was understood that those requirements should be dealt with under the provisions of paragraph 11 of annex I to General Assembly resolution 41/213 and, accordingly, should be treated outside the procedures relating to the contingency fund. In addition, the General Assembly would need to authorize the Secretary-General to enter into commitments of up to $103,000 for requirements in 1992, pending the Assembly's approval of the revised appropriations for 1992-1993.

26. Mr. TANG Guangting (China) read out the first sentence of paragraph 3 of document A/C.5/47/55: "The requests contained in paragraph 2 above are related to subprogramme 4, Enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of

(Mr. Tang Guangting, China)

periodic and genuine elections, of programme 4, Special political questions, trusteeship and decolonization, which are incorporated in the revisions to the medium-term plan for the period 1992-1997, recommended by the Committee for Programme and Coordination for adoption by the General Assembly at its current session." He wished to place on record his understanding that the Committee for Programme and Coordination (CPC) had not made such a recommendation.

27. Mr. MORET (Cuba) said that he supported the previous speaker's statement; subprogramme 4 of programme 4 was currently the subject of ongoing consultations.

28. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) asked whether the Secretariat could indicate the current and prospective charges to the contingency fund. As his delegation strongly supported the activities referred to in the draft resolution and would not wish to see them curtailed, he wondered whether an effort could be made to identify other activities from which the necessary resources could be redeployed.

29. Ms. SHENWICK (United States of America) said that her delegation also believed that the activity was important and supported the Secretary-General's proposal.

30. Mr. BOIN (France) said that the proposal was not entirely clear. If the additional expenditures were to be financed from the contingency fund, in other words, on the basis of assessed contributions, his delegation could agree to that. He shared the views expressed by the representative of Canada and hoped that the Secretariat would reply to the questions raised.

31. Mr. DUVAL (Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that, as pointed out by the representatives of China and Cuba, the reference in paragraph 3 of document A/C.5/47/55 to subprogramme 4 was an error; he expressed apologies to the Committee in that regard. The proposal for the financing of the appropriation was based on the Secretary-General's understanding that the requirements which would arise related to the maintenance of peace and security and should therefore be treated outside the procedures relating to the contingency fund. It was difficult, at the current stage, to answer the question raised by the United Kingdom representative concerning the availability of resources from the contingency fund, as substantial programme budget implications remained to be acted upon by the Committee. It was his understanding that approximately $11.2 million of the $15.5 million which remained available for 1992 had already been committed.

32. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would prefer to proceed on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, with the related commitments being treated as an advance from the Working Capital Fund, on the understanding that commitments would be a first charge against contributions received pursuant to General Assembly resolution 46/137. In that connection reference must also be made to financial regulation 6.4, which

(Mr. Kinchen, United Kingdom)

provided that advances from the Working Capital Fund should be reimbursed through the submission of supplementary programme budget proposals, except where they were recoverable from some other source.

33. Mr. BIDNY (Russian Federation) said that his delegation supported the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, but was willing to work towards a solution acceptable to all.

34. Mr. MERIFIELD (Canada) said that the United Kingdom position was interesting. He asked whether the Fifth Committee could appropriate funds from trust funds.

35. Mr. BAUDOT (Acting Controller) said that since the General Assembly had asked the Secretary-General to establish a trust fund for electoral assistance, the Fifth Committee could decide whether the activity should be financed from the regular budget or from that trust fund.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would defer its consideration of the matter, since it was clearly not in a position to take a decision.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/47/L.16 concerning agenda item 93 (b) (A/C.5/47/54)

37. Mr. ACAKPO-SATCHIVI (Secretary of the Committee), speaking on behalf of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, drew attention to document A/C.5/47/54 concerning the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/47/L.16. Under the terms of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would reiterate its request to the Secretary-General to ensure that sufficient resources were provided to the United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (UNAFRI), within the overall appropriations of the programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993, to enable the Institute to carry out, in full and on time, all its mandates. As indicated in paragraph 3 of document A/C.5/47/54, a grant to UNAFRI of $180,000 from the United Nations regular budget had been approved under the terms of General Assembly resolution 46/153, and had been provided to cover part of the administrative costs of the Institute, namely, the costs relating to the posts of Director and Deputy Director. The Advisory Committee had been informed by representatives of the Secretary-General that a balance might remain at the end of 1992. In paragraph 4 of document A/C.5/47/54, the Secretary-General stated that he intended to submit proposals on the longer-term solutions to the financing of the Institute to the Assembly at its forty-eighth session. With regard to the financial needs of UNAFRI for 1993, the Secretary-General sought the concurrence of the General Assembly in the continued use of any balance of the 1992 grant for the financing of the posts of Director and Deputy Director (para. 7). Should the balance of the 1992 grant prove insufficient for that purpose, the Secretary-General would seek the Advisory Committee's concurrence in the redeployment of the necessary resources within the overall appropriations for the biennium 1992-1993.

38. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda), supported by Mr. ONWUALIA (Nigeria), requested clarification as to whether the grant of $180,000, which had been approved for 1992, had actually been made available to the Institute, as problems had arisen in the past when appropriated funds had not been remitted. At the time of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 46/153, there had been an understanding that any balance left over from the grant would be used to cover the Institute's administrative costs.

39. Mr. DUVAL (Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that, in accordance with the usual procedure, funds were made available to the Institute through an allotment to the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA). He confirmed that the entire amount had been allotted in two instalments of $90,000 each, and that ECA would transfer those funds promptly to the Institute.

40. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in the light of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/47/54) and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.3/47/L.16, it would need to concur in the Secretary-General's proposals on the financing of UNAFRI.

41. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that the item under consideration had been the subject of prior debate. While his delegation supported the Institute's activities, it was unable to support draft resolution A/C.3/47/L.16 for budgetary reasons. If his delegation received assurances that the Secretary-General's proposals would be the basis for the report to be submitted to the General Assembly in plenary meeting, it could join the consensus in the Committee; any departures from them, however, would be a serious matter.

42. Mr. DUVAL (Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that, as indicated in paragraph 6 of document A/C.5/47/54, there had been an underexpenditure of the grant appropriated in 1991 by the General Assembly; accordingly, the Secretary-General proposed to use the balance of the grant approved for 1992 for the same purpose, namely, the financing of administrative costs.

43. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee wished to take the action he had outlined (see para. 40).

44. It was so decided.

45. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom), explaining his delegation's position on the decision just adopted, re-emphasized, for the record, the views which he had just expressed.

AGENDA ITEM 124: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ASPECTS OF THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS (continued) (A/47/484, A/47/655 and Corr.1 and A/47/757)

46. Mr. NIELSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, expressed firm support for United Nations peace-keeping activities, to which the Nordic countries were committed both politically and in terms of providing resources, having taken part in almost all peace-keeping operations and provided almost 10 per cent of the total United Nations peace-keeping force. The expanding role of the Organization in peace-keeping meant that such operations would account for almost $3 billion in 1992, which was close to three times the size of the regular budget for that year, and further increases were likely in the future. There was thus an imperative need for the Organization to establish a sound financial basis for peace-keeping activity. He welcomed the fact that the pattern of payments to peace-keeping operations had improved during 1992, but noted that outstanding assessed contributions were even higher than in previous years because of the increased level of peace-keeping budgets. That situation not only undermined the Organization's ability to carry out peace-keeping activities but also placed an additional and unfair burden on troop-contributing countries, to which the United Nations owed some $550 million. Almost half of that amount was owed to the Nordic countries.

47. The financing of peace-keeping activities must be based on the principle of collective responsibility in accordance with Article 17 of the Charter. It was thus an anomaly that UNFICYP was financed on the basis of voluntary contributions. Equally, the financing of some components of UNPROFOR constituted another exception to the rule of collective responsibility and must not create a precedent.

48. The Nordic countries fully supported the idea of a Peace-keeping Reserve Fund to facilitate the financing of the initial stage of peace-keeping operations and to cover unforeseen expenditures, and trusted that the necessary action to establish it would be taken at the current session. In addition, the idea of a Peace Endowment Fund was innovative and interesting, as was the proposal that the General Assembly should appropriate one third of the estimated cost of each new operation as soon as the Security Council decided to mount it; both suggestions merited further consideration. The Nordic countries did not support the proposal that the Secretary-General should be allowed to place contracts without competitive bidding, since such an approach did not conform to the principles of accountability and cost-effectiveness.

49. Regarding the special scale of assessments for peace-keeping operations, the Nordic countries supported the view that only the least developed countries should be placed in group (d). Since special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security rested with the permanent members of the Security Council, it was a matter of principle that the Member States in group (a) should contribute relatively more. While some anomalies might exist in the assignment of countries to groups (b) and (c), it would not

(Mr. Nielsen, Denmark)

be appropriate to make per capita national income the sole criterion in establishing those groups. In that connection he commended Spain, which, on its own initiative, had moved from group (c) to group (b).

50. Ms. Rotheiser (Austria), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

51. Mr. HEGBE (Togo) welcomed the increasing involvement of the Organization in the maintenance of international peace and security, through both negotiation and the deployment of United Nations forces. With regard to the latter, it was clear that the United Nations could not respond to the demands on its resources without the support of all Member States. Even more financial resources would be needed to implement the proposals for peace-keeping made by the Secretary-General, which his delegation supported. While he endorsed the principle of collective responsibility in financing peace-keeping operations, account must be taken of capacity to pay and of level of development. A scale based on such an approach would provide substantial and predictable resources. His delegation supported the recommendation for training in peace-keeping activities, and welcomed the establishment of the Department of Peace-keeping Operations as part of a more rational structure.

52. Mr. NEJEDLÝ (Czechoslovakia) said that Czechoslovakia should be transferred from group (b) to group (c), but respected the view that a decision thereon should be taken only after the two successor States to the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic had been admitted to the Organization in January 1993.

53. His delegation welcomed the consideration in the report of the Secretary-General (A/47/484) of the issue of anomalies. No one refuted that per capita national income should be the basic criterion in determining assessments for peace-keeping operations, a fact that must be reflected in the Committee's resolutions. A solution to the problem of financing of peace-keeping operations must be found on an urgent basis.

54. Mr. RANDRIAMALALA (Madagascar) said that the apportionment of the costs of peace-keeping operations had always been a delicate matter, involving the use of special arrangements. The Committee now had three choices. Firstly, it could support the scale proposed in annex II to document A/47/484; while the methodology was somewhat simplistic, it was clear. Secondly, the Committee could overhaul the current system of apportionment, and formulate new criteria for the establishment of the groups. That would be a difficult undertaking. Should the Committee proceed in that manner, the current members of group (a) should maintain their special status in terms of apportionment of expenses. Thirdly, as a middle course, the current groups could be maintained, but with appropriate reclassifications so as to remove anomalies. Of the three options, the middle course accorded best with the views of the General Assembly at the forty-sixth session. In any event, it was important to take a decision at the current session in order to classify the new Member

(Mr. Randriamalala, Madagascar)

States and to reclassify States experiencing economic difficulties, particularly the least developed countries.

55. Mr. HENG Choon Boon (Singapore) said that peace-keeping operations must be funded on a just basis. In that connection, his delegation would have reservations regarding any system that used per capita national income as the sole criterion.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.